



Interview Summary

Claim(s) discussed:

	Application No. 09/824,905	Applicant(s) 09/824,90	09/824,905 Art Unit 1637	
Interview Summary	Examiner Joyce Tu			
All participants (applicant, applicant's representativ	re, PTO personnel):			
(1) Joyce Tung	(3)	(3)		
(1) doyce rung	(3/			
	(4)			
(2) Stephen Macevocz				
(2) <u>Stephen Macevocz</u> Date of Interview <u>Feb 14, 2003</u> Type: a) □ Telephonic b) □ Video Conferency C) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) □ applications of the conferency of	(4)	epresentative]		

Identification of prior art discussed:
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
Discussed the prior art and the instant invention. Applicants proposed the further amendment to clarify the differences.
Applicants proposed to amend the specification to add the support from the parent case for new claims.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable
available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required